



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/815,691	04/02/2004	George Harry Hoffman	062834-0223	9713
22428 7590 04/01/2008 FOLEY AND LARDNER LLP SUITE 500 3000 K STREET NW WASHINGTON, DC 20007				
EXAMINER				
POND, ROBERT M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3625				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/01/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/815,691

**Applicant(s)**

HOFFMAN ET AL.

**Examiner**

Robert M. Pond

**Art Unit**

3625

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/05/07; 12/20/07.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24, 26-46, 48-55 and 57-59 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24, 26-46, 48-55 and 57-59 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 02 April 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

Examination is based on claims entered 11 April 2007 incorporating supported subject matter not previously examined prior to the final office action now withdrawn. In that amendment, the Applicant canceled claims 25, 47 and 56 and newly added claims 57-59. All pending claims 1-24, 26-46, 48-55 and 57-59 were examined in this non-final office action necessitated by new grounds of rejection.

### ***Response to Arguments***

The pre-appeal conference decision entered 20 December 2007 reopened prosecution based on the final office action entered 05 July 2007. The finality of that action is withdrawn.

Applicants' arguments, see Remarks, filed 05 November 2007, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-24, 26-46, 48-55 and 57-59 under 35 USC 103 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Duncan and Yehia. The primary reference Schleicher relied upon in the withdrawn final office action is withdrawn, now rendering arguments moot.

Admitted Prior Art (ON1 and ON2)

ON1 and ON2 are no longer relied upon in the office action but remain as admitted prior art.

If applicant does not seasonably traverse the well-known statement, or official notice, during examination, then the object of the well-known statement is admitted as prior art. In re Chevenard, 139 F.2d 71, 60 USPQ 239 (CCPA 1943). A seasonable challenge constitutes a demand for evidence made as soon as practicable during prosecution. Thus, applicant is charged with rebutting the well-known statement in the next reply after the Office action in which the well-known statement was made.

To adequately traverse an official notice, an applicant must specifically point out the supposed errors in the examiner's action, stating why the noticed fact is not considered to be common knowledge or well-known in the art. See 37 CFR 1.11 I(b). See also Chevenard, 139 F.2d at 713, 60 USPQ at 241. A general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without any reference to the examiner's assertion of official notice is inadequate. [MPEP 2144.03(c)]. As in this case, where the applicant has not traversed the examiner's assertion of official notice, the statement is taken to be admitted prior art.

**Examiner Notes Pertaining to Selectable Display Option**

**Note 1:** At least independent claims 1, 26, 48 and 55 claim an option for the single purchase order to be used to order products for more than one store

location whereby a separate conditional claim element is used to perfect the subject matter for the conditional branch. The prior art covers both branches of the "if-then" condition. Applicants' future claim perfection of the conditional branch is at risk of being undermined by the branch for ordering for just one store location unless both branches are perfected for allowability. The Examiner is recommending language to remove the conditional statement. Examination is based on a condition of ordering products for more than one store location using a single purchase order which also covers ordering product(s) for just one store location using a single purchase order.

The same rationale applies to at least claims 12, 35, 51 and 57-59.

**Note 2:** While the selectable option for address view/item view is depicted in Fig. 3EE, Figure 3FF fails to clearly illustrate an item view over the store view of Fig. 3EE. Fig. 3FF is identical to Fig. 3EE. Therefore, a description of what the item view represents is based solely on the disclosures in the instant specification. See Drawings below.

**Note 3:** While the use of a selectable display feature is useful, in the context of a modern computerized database system, sorting and displaying data which are related/associated with each other is well known in the arts. In light of the prior art cited below, it would have been recognized that applying the technique of Duncan to organize and display computerized database information in an item

view would have yielded predictable results because the level of ordinary skill in the art demonstrated by the Duncan reference applied shows the ability to incorporate such data processing features.

### ***Drawings***

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the selectable feature that provides an item view in Fig. 3FF must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner,

the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

- 1. Claims 45, 46 and 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.**

Applicants' claim a system but merely rely upon logic without any computing and execution structural specificity necessary to meet tangible embodiment requirements. Correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

- 2. Claims 45, 46 and 58 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.**

Applicants' claim a system but merely rely upon logic without any computing and execution structural specificity necessary to meet tangible embodiment

requirements. Correction is required. Examination was based on the assumption of a tangible embodiment of the logic executed by a computer.

- 3. Claims 48-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.**

Applicants' are claiming a computer (apparatus) and method claim elements concurrently. Statutory class switch renders these claims indefinite due ambiguity. Correction is required. Examination was based on the assumption of the claim being a method claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

- 4. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 11, 22, 26, 29, 31, 34, 48 and 54 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Duncan (US 6,934,692).**



Duncan teaches all the limitations of claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 11, 22, 26, 29, 31, 34, 48 and 54. For example, Duncan discloses a system and methods of transacting business over a secure network between multiple registered buyers and registered sellers. Duncan further discloses:

- Regarding claim 48. a supply chain management computer receiving in a supply chain system from a buyer who has entered a buyer system ID a selection of an item to order; the buyer and/or seller may be required to have predetermined access rights as discussed above in order to enter interactive database by way of using a user identification (I.D.) code, e.g., a user I.D., password, I.D number. See at least col. 9, lines 5-9. pre-registered user with password places an order via the secure system. See at least col. 3, lines 50-59; col. 9, lines 37-52.
- Regarding claim 48. providing a display option to the buyer to generate an order to a supplier for an individual store only or to order for a plurality of stores of the buyer; display identifies the option of shipping to multiple FOB sites; for a given order, buyer can select/add multiple FOB sites to the system to identify various drop shipping points. See at least col. 9, lines 52-57; col. 10, lines 4-8.
- Regarding claim 48. if an order is to be generated, order can be placed for an individual item or multiple products (see at least Fig. 7; Fig. 9; col. 9, lines 37-57), for a plurality of stores of the buyer, the supply chain management computer displaying an electronic order form for generating

an order for the plurality of different stores associated with the buyer system ID, wherein a designation for each of the plurality of the stores is displayed. purchase confirmation requires buyer's personal ID number (see at least Fig. 9); website displays various features (see at least Fig. 6) and web forms used to make a purchase (see at least Figs. 7-10; col. 9, line 58-col. 10, line 24). Inherent in Duncan are the structures necessary to permits the designation with each different store having a separate order amount field. For example, Duncan teaches:

- i) buyer can order one or more products and the buyer can select/add multiple FOB sites to the system to identify various drop shipping points for one or more purchased products.
- ii) A web page 901 in FIG. 9 further illustrates a purchase order, shipping, and fee information in accordance with an exemplary embodiment of the present invention. For example, web page 901 displays the product, size, packaging, quality, origin, label, quantity in pounds, price per pound, freight price per pound, total prices, total sale price, shipping information, payment options, order date, and delivery date. See at least col. 10, lines 7-18.
- iii) various other information may also or alternatively be displayed depending on the industry and/or use for which interactive database is implemented. See at least col. 10, lines 18-24.

From the above, Duncan teaches information known by the system and displayed by the system: quantity of one or more items being ordered by the buyer, amount per unit, the total price for each item order, and the price of the total order of items; and for the case of multiple FOB drop sites for one or more products chosen by the buyer, the system knows the amount being dropped off at each site by the carrier. For the system to know how much to ship to each drop site, the buyer must designate via the system the order amount that is shipped to each drop site.

- Regarding claim 48, receiving data to populate the order amount field for at least one of the plurality of stores; provides data to populate the order amount for at least one of the drop sites as noted above. See at least Fig. 9; See at least col. 10, lines 7-18.
- Regarding claim 48, and sending out the electronic order form to at least one supplier; transmits the order form to the supplier. See at least Fig. 9; col. 10, lines 25-49.
- Regarding aspects of claim 52, providing data for a display of selected electronic catalogue items from different vendors for a piece of equipment; and wherein the selection is of one of the catalogue items displayed from the electronic catalogue. displays catalog information. See at least Figs. 7-10.

- Regarding 54. populating a web display with data from the electronic order form and data from a supplier inventory to obtain an electronic fulfillment form; populates a web page with supplier inventory (see at least Fig. 7-10), and serving web content to display the electronic fulfillment form to a supplier listed in the electronic order form. buyer completes the order form and seller receives the order. See at least Fig. 9; Fig. 10 (reflects changes in inventory); col. 10, lines 25-49.
- Regarding claims 11 and 34. Rejections are based on the disclosures noted above. Duncan discloses buying food for a business with one or more business locations-could be any type of business that requires food purchases.
- Regarding claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 22, 26, 29, and 31. Rejections are based on the disclosures noted above.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

**5. Claims 6 and 30 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duncan (US 6,934,692) in view of Tondervold (US 5,410,646).**

- Regarding claim 30. Duncan teaches all the above as noted under the 102 rejection and teaches the buyer with a user ID routing a purchase request for approval. Although Duncan does not mention sending data to cause display

of the electronic order form facilitating a segmented permission portion, Tondervold on the other hand teaches a system and methods for creating, processing and storing forms electronically, and further teaches providing fields on a purchase order for manager approval. See at least abstract; Fig. 2; Fig. 3; col. 4, line 61-col. 5, line 15. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have recognized that applying the known technique of Tondervold of segmenting a purchase order with segmented portions for use by other employees would have yielded predictable results and resulted in an improved system. It would have been recognized that applying the technique of Tondervold to the teachings of Duncan would have yielded predictable results because the level of ordinary skill in the art demonstrated by the references applied shows the ability to incorporate such data processing features into similar systems. Obviousness under 35 USC 103 in view of the Supreme Court decision *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*

- Regarding claim 6. Rejection is based on the rationale as noted above.

**6. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duncan (US 6,934,692).**

Duncan teaches all the above as noted under the 102 rejection and teaches i) the display identifies the option of shipping to multiple FOB sites and ii) for a given order, buyer can select/add multiple FOB sites to the system to identify

various drop shipping points for multiple business locations. Please note: drop shipping implies eliminating the middleman or intermediate location for subsequent shipping to the FOB sites. Therefore it would have been obvious to try by one of ordinary skill in the art at time the invention was made to select an intermediate shipping address for one or more of the business locations and incorporate it into the system and methods of Duncan since there are a finite number of identified, predictable potential solutions to the recognized need and one of ordinary skill in the art could have pursued the known potential solutions with a reasonable expectation of success. Obviousness under 35 USC 103 in view of the Supreme Court decision *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*

**7. Claims 9, 20, 32, 42 and 52 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duncan (US 6,934,692) in view of Barnes (US 5,970,475).**

- Regarding claims 20 and 32. Duncan teaches all the above as noted under the 102 rejection and teaches i) a user ordering products for one or more business locations using a single order form and ii) routing the purchase request for approval. Although Duncan does not mention ordering from vendor catalogs or comparing a monetary amount from the electronic order form for a given store to a threshold amount and generating a message if the threshold amount is exceeded, Barnes on the other hand teaches a procurement system whereby requisitioners can complete requisitions quickly and accurately by selecting goods from electronic catalogs or by using

requisition templates that have been defined for them by purchasing managers. Requisitions can contain items from one or more suppliers. The customer server 34 automatically checks requisitions against the spending limit defined for each employee. If the requisition is within this limit, customer server automatically approves the requisition, then creates and sends an EDI formatted purchase order to each supplier included in the requisition. If this exceeds the spending limit the customer server automatically forwards it to an authorized employee for approval. See at least abstract; Figs. 1-5; Fig. 11; col. 6, lines 54-65; col. 25, lines 26-40. One of ordinary skill in the art at time the invention was made would have recognized that applying the known technique of Barnes to automatically check requisitions against the spending limit and sending a message would have yielded predictable results and resulted in an improved system. It would have been recognized that applying the technique of Barnes to the teachings of Duncan would have yielded predictable results because the level of ordinary skill in the art demonstrated by the references applied shows the ability to incorporate such data processing features into similar systems. Obviousness under 35 USC 103 in view of the Supreme Court decision *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*

- Regarding claims 9, 42 and 52. Rejections are based on the rationale as noted above.

**8. Claims 10 and 33 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duncan (US 6,934,692) in view of Barnes (US 5,970,475).**

- Regarding claim 33. Duncan teaches all the above as noted under the 102 rejection and teaches i) a user with user ID ordering products for one or more business locations using a single order form. Although Duncan does not mention aggregating a dollar amount from a plurality of completed electronic order forms from different buyers system ID's that manage different sets of stores for a given customer, comparing the aggregated dollar amount to a threshold amount and generating a message if the threshold amount is exceeded. Barnes on the other hand teaches a procurement system whereby requisitioners can complete requisitions quickly and accurately by selecting goods from electronic catalogs or by using requisition templates that have been defined for them by purchasing managers. Requisitions can contain items from one or more suppliers. The customer server 34 automatically checks requisitions against the spending limit defined for each employee. If the requisition is within this limit, customer server automatically approves the requisition, then creates and sends an EDI formatted purchase order to each supplier included in the requisition. If this exceeds the spending limit the customer server automatically forwards it to an authorized employee for approval. See at least abstract; col. 25, lines 26-40. One of ordinary skill in the art at time the invention was made would have recognized that applying the known technique of Barnes to automatically check an individual's



requisitions against the spending limit (i.e. individual's spending limit) and sending a message would have yielded predictable results and resulted in an improved system. It would have been recognized that applying the technique of Barnes to the teachings of Duncan would have yielded predictable results because the level of ordinary skill in the art demonstrated by the references applied shows the ability to incorporate such data processing features into similar systems. Obviousness under 35 USC 103 in view of the Supreme Court decision *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*

Duncan and Barnes teach and suggest all the above and teach and suggest i) comparing a purchase requisition value to the individual's spending limit and ii) sending a message to an authorized employee for approval if the individual's spending limit is exceeded. As a consequence automatically checking all requisitions against spending limits authorized for each individual submitting one or more requisitions and sending a message to an authorized employee for approval if a spending limit is exceeded, it would have been obvious to try by one of ordinary skill in the art at time the invention was made to compare the aggregate dollar amount of all requisitions to a threshold and send a message if the threshold amount is exceeded and incorporate it into the system and methods of Duncan and Barnes since there are a finite number of identified, predictable potential solutions to the recognized need and one of ordinary skill in the art could have pursued the known potential solutions with a reasonable expectation of

success. Obviousness under 35 USC 103 in view of the Supreme Court decision *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*

- Regarding claim 10. Rejection is based on the same rationale as noted above.

**9. Claim 2, 4, 12-19, 21, 23, 24, 27, 28, 35-41, 43-46, 49-51, 53, 55 and 57-59 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duncan (US 6,934,692) in view of Yehia (US 2002/0147726, Paper #20070103).**

- Regarding method claims 49-51 and 53. Duncan teaches all the above as noted under the 102 rejection and teaches a computerized database system managing electronic procurement and purchase order displays and further teaches i) a buyer with buyer ID using a single purchase order to order from a supplier product(s) to be shipped to a single business location and viewing the purchase order in a store view assigning each product to the store location (note: as defined by Applicants) (see Fig. 9), ii) a buyer with buyer ID using a single purchase order to order from a supplier a single type of product or multiple products to be shipped to multiple business locations (note: Duncan implies for the situation of multiple FOB sites that the purchase order would organize product by stores, each product being assigned to one or more stores as illustrated in Fig. 9) and iii) the supplier accepting the single purchase order for one or more products to be shipped to one or more locations. Therefore it would have been obvious to try by one of ordinary skill

in the art at time the invention was made to provide on the purchase order form selection between store organization and an item organization and incorporate it into the system and methods of Duncan since there are a finite number of identified, predictable potential solutions to the recognized need and one of ordinary skill in the art could have pursued the known potential solutions with a reasonable expectation of success. It would have been recognized that applying the technique of Duncan to organize and display computerized database information would have yielded predictable results because the level of ordinary skill in the art demonstrated by the Duncan reference applied shows the ability to incorporate such data processing features. Obviousness under 35 USC 103 in view of the Supreme Court decision *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*

Duncan teaches all the above as noted under the 103(a) rejection and teaches i) using a buyer's profile to complete a purchase transaction, ii) the system automatically recalling a buyer's previously selected FOB sites and iii) the buyer designating via the system the order amount shipped to each drop site. Although Duncan does not mention sending data to present a graphical buyer interface with an option to automatically populate the order amount field for each of a plurality of the stores with a quantity entered in the order amount field for one of the stores and a plurality of the stores include an attribute associated therewith; and wherein an order amount field for a plurality of the stores with said attribute is determined automatically, at least in part, by the

attribute. Yehia teaches automatically populating data fields and automatically extracting data from fields to facilitate business transactions between trading partners and enforces business rules that include implications of the quantities ordered and the time period on pricing and potential discounts (see at least 0117). Note interpretation: relationship between discounted pricing and quantity are enforced by business rules applied by the system. One of ordinary skill in the art at time the invention was made would have recognized that applying the known technique of Yehia would have yielded predictable results and resulted in an improved system. It would have been recognized that applying the technique of Yehia to the teachings of Duncan would have yielded predictable results because the level of ordinary skill in the art demonstrated by the references applied shows the ability to incorporate such data processing features into similar systems. Obviousness under 35 USC 103 in view of the Supreme Court decision *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*

- Regarding claims 2, 4, 12-19, 21, 23, 24, 27, 28, 35-41, 43-46, 55 and 57-59. Rejections are based on the rationale as noted above.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert M. Pond whose telephone number is 571-272-6760. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Jeff Smith can be reached on 571-272-6763. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Robert M. Pond/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3625  
March 29, 2008